

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT

QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

Cooperative Agreement Number: *X8-83698001*

Reporting Period: *May 1, 2020 to July 31, 2020 (Year 3, Quarter 4/Final)*

Date Submitted: *September 1, 2020*

Prepared by:

*eXtension Foundation
c/o Bryan Cave LLP
One Kansas City Place
1200 Main Street, Suite 3800
Kansas City, MO 64105-2122*

Submitted to:

*Ryne Yarger
EPA Project Officer
Yarger.Ryne@epa.gov*

Project Narrative Summary

Under EPA cooperative agreement, X8-83698001, eXtension Foundation (eX) created and implemented an online application process for Pesticide Safety Education Program Coordinators (PSEP) for the Pesticide Safety Education Funds Management Program (PSEFMP) funding opportunity for the second year. Utilizing Survey Monkey Apply, an online application process was created for the 2020 funding year, in order for PSEP coordinators to submit applications, provide review of those applications by the advisory committee, award applications, and provide post award services including ongoing communication with awardees.

Applicants complete a six (6) section application form:

1. Applicant Eligibility
 - a. Land Grant University affiliation
 - b. PSEP Coordinator Contact Information
 - c. Institutional Information
2. Subaward Work
 - a. Goals
 - b. Evaluation
 - c. Licensed Work Product
 - i. Deliverable
 - ii. PSEP Collaboration Potential
3. Budget
 - a. Proposed Budget
 - b. Budget Justifications
4. Office of Sponsored Programs
 - a. Office of Sponsored Programs Contact Information
 - b. Audit Information
5. Commitments
 - a. Progress Reports
 - b. Trainings
 - c. Personal Development Opportunities
6. Subaward Agreement

The announcement of this funding opportunity was provided on August 27, 2019 via email to all PSEP coordinators, and Extension directors notifying of the opportunity and outlining the online application process. A funding formula was established utilizing ninety five (95) of the funds for year two and any rollover of un-awarded funds from year one to establish a base amount for each state or territory. Each PSEP was eligible to apply for a base amount of \$17,200.00. The remaining five (5) percent was divided proportionally based on the number of certified applicators per state or territory. The number of certified applicators in a state or territory was based on the most recent figures of certified applicators supplied by the EPA.

The online system launched on September 16, 2019 at 8 am EST to receive applications.

The application system closed on November 15, 2019, at 8pm EST. PSEPs received timely announcements regarding the funding opportunity and 88% (50/57) applied for sub-awards. This is a decrease of 3% from the applications received for the 2019 funding. Extension deadlines were allowed for one (1) state based on extenuating circumstances provided by the PSEP coordinator. An extension was granted to the following state:

- Oregon

Fifty two (52) applications were received, however only fifty (50) were completed through submission, therefore only fifty (50) sub-award applications were funded. The states that did not receive funding for the 2020 cycle are listed below:

- South Dakota (application started but not submitted)
- Maryland (application started but not submitted)
- Indiana
- Washington D.C.
- Wisconsin
- Michigan
- Micronesia

One hundred (100) percent (%) of sub-award funds were distributed to eligible PSEPs within 30 days of the advisory committee decision of approval. One hundred (100) percent (%) of subrecipients understand program expectations and compliance requirements. One hundred (100) percent (%) of subrecipients' compliance/subaward agreements have been finalized.

Applicants stated..."everything was very simple and easy to understand" and "you could not have made this any easier".

1. PROJECT PROGRESS

Progress reported in this section will clearly identify only those activities performed during the reporting period that were undertaken with EPA funds, and will relate EPA-funded activities to the objectives and milestones agreed upon in the grant work-plan.

1.1 Status of Activities During the Reporting Period

Completed tasks:

1. eX held online and face to face meetings among grant partners:

- a. One hour meetings occurred the first Thursday of every month with the National Pesticide Safety Education Center (NPSEC) to discuss the layout of the application process, application content and proposed acceptable deliverables.
2. Subrecipient eligibility established to limit funding to land-grant university extension programs in all 50 states, U.S. territories and the District of Columbia
3. Base amount of funding was established based on three (3) year average, 2013 - 2015, of the number of applicators certified in the applicants jurisdiction:
 - a. Ninety five (95) percent (%) of the funds for year two and rollover of un-awarded funds from year one were taken to provide a base amount to all PSEP coordinators in the amount of \$17,200.00. The remaining five (5) percent (%) of the funds were then divided proportionally based on the percentage of the number of certified applicators in each state or territory. The number of certified applicators in a state or territory was based on the most recent figures of certified applicators as supplied by the EPA.
4. eX maintained the online application and reporting system.
 - a. Contracted with Survey Monkey Apply to continue to be the host site for the online application process.
 - b. The online progress report webform for 2020 was created. Sub-awardees have and will submit these reports online through Survey Monkey Apply at six months and twelve months. Dates of submission for the progress reports were July 31, 2020 and will be January 31, 2021.
5. eX generated and announced the funding opportunity and application process.
 - a. Announcement was made to all PSEP Coordinators on August 27, 2020 for the 2020 funds.
 - b. Announcements were sent via email to all PSEP coordinators, and Extension directors.
 - c. Announcements were posted on eXtension Foundation and NPSEC websites.
6. eX offered online trainings for application site (Survey Monkey Apply)
 - a. September 16 at 11 am EST and 3 pm EST
 - b. September 17 at 2 pm EST
 - c. September 18 at 3 pm EST
 - d. September 19 at 2 pm EST
 - e. September 23 at 7 pm EST (Specifically scheduled to accommodate those in the Pacific Islands).
7. Subrecipients created applications using a simplified online process (Survey Monkey Apply)
 - a. The application system opened on September 16, 2019 at 8 am EST.
8. A fast and efficient sub-recipient award process was utilized to receive and approve applications. This process is outlined below:
 - a. Applications were submitted via the online application system Survey Monkey Apply complete with an institutionally signed sub-award agreement
 - b. Advisory Committee reviewed applications for compliance and fundability

- c. If additional information was needed from the applicant, the Project Manager emailed the applicant advising of the additional information requested and reopened the application in the application site.
 - d. If the application was approved, the application was then moved to “Awarded” status in the Survey Monkey Apply site.
 - e. Applicants were notified via email that their application had been approved. The email included the official award package of official award letter, application and fully executed sub-award agreement.
9. eX tracked the movement of each step of the distribution process in multiple spreadsheets based on relevant information. These spreadsheets are posted in Google docs and only the administration has access. The sheets were and are used by the Project Manager, Tira Adelman to determine if all time frames are being met. Problems, concerns and issues delaying the process for each sub-recipient are noted and resolutions are determined and implemented to increase the efficiency of the process in subsequent years. The spreadsheets utilized are the following:
 - a. Sub-award Tracking - this sheet was specifically designed for tracking the movement of the sub-awards from application submission until the award ends after the one year sub-award term. Categories in this sheet include: status; project number (SA-2020-xx); PSEP coordinator name; state/territory; institution; project title; topic area; subtopic area; deliverable; amount available (per funding formula); amount requested; date funds disbursed; PSEP coordinator email; and PSEP phone number.
 - b. Administrative and Fundability Review Checklist PSEFMP Applications - this sheet was specifically designed for use during the Advisory Committee’s review of applications for compliance and fundability. Categories in this sheet include: all 50 states, the territories and the District of Columbia; criteria of the committee’s review, for example “Does the deliverable topic and subtopic area match the type of product selected for sharing?”; notes on committee’s discussion and decisions on recommendation to approve, and disapprove or hold the application.
 - c. Program Collaboration - this sheet was specifically designed for use of the Program Review Subcommittee in reviewing sub-awards for the purpose of potential collaboration among PSEPs. Categories in this sheet include: project number; PSEP coordinator name; state/territory; region; institution; project title; topic area; subtopic area; deliverable; description of deliverable; indicated willingness to work with other PSEPs; PSEP coordinator email; and PSEP coordinator phone number. Additionally this sheet includes pivot tables in order to organize the data into groups for ease of use and understanding of the different projects. The pivot tables are sorted by topic area; deliverable; subtopic area and topic area by region.
10. Subrecipients must comply with all reporting requirements. They are explained online and help is offered for those with questions.
11. One hundred (100) percent (%) of subrecipients understand program expectations and compliance requirements.

12. The Compliance Review Committee conducted two rounds of reviews prior to the deadline of November 15, 2019 in order to review any applications that had already been received.
 - a. The first round of review occurred on November 4, 2019. The committee reviewed applications from the following states:
 - i. Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, Guam, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington, and West Virginia
 - b. The second round of review occurred on December 4, 2019. The committee reviewed applications from the following states:
 - i. Alabama, Alaska, American Samoa, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Texas, US Virgin Islands, Vermont, Virginia, and Wyoming
13. eX offered a training session on the reporting system (Survey Monkey Apply) on November 13, 2019 at 2:30 pm EST
14. Funding announcements were made to sub-recipients in one group on December 13, 2019. Announcements were sent via email advising that their application had been approved for funding and the requirements set forth by accepting this funding, i.e. progress reporting every six months. The email included an attachment of the official award letter, application package and fully executed sub-award agreement.
15. PSEPs received timely announcements regarding the funding opportunity and 88% applied for sub-awards. eXtension Foundation's original goal was to have 90% of the PSEPs apply for sub-awards, so we are just shy of hitting that mark. Based on the increase in numbers from 2018 to 2019, I was confident we would hit that 90% in 2020. However, despite the drop in applications one new territory/commonwealth applied for the funding opportunity this year.
 - a. Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas/Saipan/Northern Marianas College
Five states, the District of Columbia and one territory either started but did not complete an application or did not start applications. For those that did not submit an application an email was sent requesting the reason as to why. If available I have included the reasons that were indicated as to why an application was not submitted.
 - b. Indiana - N/A
 - c. Michigan - N/A
 - d. Wisconsin - N/A
 - e. South Dakota - PSEP coordinator stated the following, "Thanks for reaching out but, due to a few factors, my colleagues and I decided we're not going to submit for 2020. Thanks again for providing an extension"!
 - f. Maryland - PSEP coordinator stated the following, "Thank you, Tira, but I decided not to apply for the funds for next year. My Department has an open search to fill the position from which I retired, which includes Coordinating Maryland's PSEP,

of course, and I hope with every fiber of my being that she/he will be on board by fall semester 2020. In the meantime I am continuing as Coordinator but with very minimal time commitment and I simply can't commit to another project".

- g. District of Columbia - N/A
 - h. Micronesia - N/A
16. One hundred (100) percent (%) of sub-awards were distributed to eligible PSEPs within 30 days of the advisory committee decision.
 17. Subrecipients complied with all reporting requirements. These requirements were explained online in the application site and help was and is available to those with questions. Subrecipients agreed to comply with all reporting requirements within the application. Section 7 of the application was dedicated to commitments of the sub-recipients. In this section subrecipients agreed to submit progress reports every six (6) months, attend a minimum of one (1) hour long training webinars as part of this program for reporting system training and professional development, and to attend one professional development opportunity, for example attend the EPA Pesticide Applicator Certification Training (PACT) meeting.
 18. One hundred (100) percent (%) of subrecipients understand program expectations and compliance requirements.
 19. Ninety nine (99) percent (%) of PSEPs met application requirements and deadlines. Out of the fifty two (52) applications received, one (1) missed the submission deadline and had to request an extension. The states that requested extension are as follows:
 - a. Oregon
 10. One hundred (100) percent (%) of subrecipients' compliance/subaward agreements have been finalized. Subrecipients were required to submit a signed partially executed agreement before submission of the applications. This was to ensure agreement with compliance requirements and eXtension Foundations' terms and conditions in exchange for receiving these funds.
 11. A link to a brief survey monkey was sent to subrecipients to determine their satisfaction with the process. Two surveys were sent, one immediately after submission of application, with receipt of application acknowledgement. The second was sent after the last group of applications were approved for funding.
 - b. The first survey asked applicants to rate their experience using a five star scale in which 1 star being their experience was terrible and 5 being their experience was excellent. We received no responses to this survey.
 - c. A link to a brief survey monkey was sent to sub-recipients to determine their satisfaction with the process. Two surveys were sent, one immediately after submission of application, with receipt of application acknowledgement. The second was sent after the last group of applications were approved for funding.
 - a. The first survey asked applicants to rate their experience using a five star scale in which 1 star being their experience was terrible and 5 being their experience was excellent. We received no responses to this survey.
 - b. The second survey was provided via email to sub-awardees on January 14, 2020. This survey was designed to evaluate and solicit feedback for the entire

application process and was designed to take no longer than two (2) minutes to complete. Thirteen (13) sub-awardees responded to the survey. The questions and results of the survey are included below:

1. Overall, how well does the application site meet your needs?
 - a. Extremely well - 76.92%
 - b. Very well - 23.08%
 - c. Somewhat well - 0.00%
 - d. Not so well - 0.0%
 - e. Not at all well - 0.0%
2. How easy was it to find what you were looking for on the application site?
 - a. Extremely easy - 69.23%
 - b. Very easy - 23.08%
 - c. Somewhat easy - 7.69%
 - d. Not so easy - 0.0%
 - e. Not at all easy - 0.0%
3. Did it take you more or less time than you expected to complete an application?
 - a. A lot less time - 23.08%
 - b. A little less time - 23.08%
 - c. About what I expected - 53.85%
 - d. A little more time - 0.00%
 - e. A lot more time - 0.0%
4. What process and/or section created the most delay in submitting your application.
 - a. Free form option
 - i. Finding the link to log in and budget
 - ii. Our grants office signature and approvals
 - iii. This was my first year using this system and working with the University of Arizona and therefore I just needed a little extra time to gather the appropriate documents and signatures. However, this was not due to the format of the site or the application itself.
 - iv. Budgeting.
 - v. I don't remember.
 - vi. Waiting on OSP.
 - vii. Dealing with my own institution, getting the approval.
 - viii. Budget information - not knowing the level of detail needed.
 - ix. Our office of sponsored programs sign off.
 - x. Just getting other people's signatures/ok.

- xi. Getting sponsored programs to do their part.
 - xii. OSP approval for upload of signed subaward agreement.
 - xiii. Remembering the URL.
5. How easy is it to understand the information on the application site?
- a. Extremely easy - 53.85%
 - b. Very easy - 38.46%
 - c. Somewhat easy - 7.69%
 - d. Not so easy - 0.0%
 - e. Not at all easy - 0.0%
6. How easy was it to understand the terms of the subaward agreement?
- a. Extremely easy - 38.46%
 - b. Very easy - 15.38%
 - c. Somewhat easy - 38.46%
 - d. Not so easy - 7.69%
 - e. Not easy at all - 0.0%
7. Did the application site trainings held prior to the launch of the application site help you in navigating the site?
- a. A great deal - 69.23%
 - b. A lot - 15.38%
 - c. A moderate amount - 0.00%
 - d. A little - 0.00%
 - e. Not at all - 0.0%
 - f. I didn't attend any of the training sessions - 15.38%
8. How would you rate your experience using the online application site? (star rating)
- a. Terrible - 0.0%
 - b. Just okay - 0.0%
 - c. Neutral - 7.69%
 - d. Good - 7.69%
 - e. Excellent - 84.62%
9. Do you have any other comments or suggestions about how we can improve the application site?
- a. Free form option
 - i. Include the link to the site in the reminder emails as well and not just the initial email.
 - ii. Keep up the good work.
 - iii. No. I think it all went well and I appreciate Tira's willingness to respond quickly to questions I had about the application process.
 - iv. No.

- v. Great application site
 - vi. Tira has made the biggest difference in her ability to describe and explain the features of the site and her ready access!
 - vii. Tira is a very helpful asset to the process. Very responsive.
 - viii. The application site is easy to use and user friendly. I have no complaints.
 - ix. Not at this time.
12. Due to the excessive number of No Cost Extension requests we received for the 2018 funds, this option was not offered to sub-awardees for the 2019 funding cycle. Sub-awardees were again encouraged to spend down all monies awarded within the 2019 funding cycle and that all unused funds must be returned at the end of the sub-award agreement, December 31, 2019.
13. eX offered online trainings for final progress report submission on Survey Monkey Apply
- a. December 2 at 3 pm EST
 - b. January 15 at 3 pm EST
14. Sub-recipients must comply with all reporting requirements. They are explained online and help is offered for those with questions.
- a. The deadline for submission of the Final Progress Report and required shareable deliverable was January 31, 2020.
 - b. Final progress reports tracked the progress of the project/program, if the required deliverable was submitted, the final budget numbers and if collaboration between programs occurred.
 - c. Actual Collaboration occurred between thirty (33) programs.
 - i. Illinois and Mississippi
 - ii. Maryland, New Jersey and Iowa
 - iii. Ohio and South Carolina
 - iv. Oregon and Colorado
 - v. Tennessee and Georgia
 - vi. Connecticut, North Carolina, Minnesota, Delaware, Utah and National Pesticide Safety Education Center
 - vii. Kansas and Colorado
 - viii. North Dakota and Minnesota
 - ix. Utah, Arkansas, Colorado, Montana, Minnesota, Wyoming, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Florida, Texas and Hawaii
 - d. In the 2020 application, thirty (30) or sixty (60) percent (%) of programs indicated they were willing to collaborate with another program. If they did not indicate they were willing to collaborate eX will reach out to them after the Program Review Committee meets to make them aware of identified potential collaborations to see if they are willing to collaborate. Last year for the 2019 funding thirty two (31) or sixty four (64) percent (%) of programs indicated their willingness to collaborate with another program. .

- e. Going forward further efforts will be taken in order to track these collaborations and the outcome(s). On the application for 2020 the question was specifically asked, if a coordinator was willing to collaborate and if so, if they had a particular program in mind. By having this as a starting point in the application will better allow us to track, encourage and support these collaborations. Example of the items we would like to track and questions to be answered by these collaborations
 - i. What did they do (activity)?
 - ii. Output of that activity?
 - iii. Selected outcome(s):
 - 1. Improved quality
 - 2. Increased reach to new audiences with additional languages
 - 3. Increased enrollments by putting information online
 - 4. Saved time by adopting material from others
 - 5. Reduced duplication of effort
- 20. eX offered online trainings for first six month progress report submission utilizing Survey Monkey Apply
 - a. May 13, 2020 at 3:00 pm EST
 - b. June 23, 2020 at 6:00 pm EST (Specifically scheduled for coordinators in the Pacific Islands)
 - c. July 1, 2020 at 2:00 pm EST
- 21. Formal requests for all unused funds will be sent to institutions via email after all final reports are submitted and reviewed. All unused funds will be placed into the account and used in the total amount of funding for 2021.
- 22. eX met with strategic partners to review progress and make adjustments.
 - a. Every Monday morning eX Project Manager attends NPSEC staff meetings in order to review progress for the PSEFMP, solicit feedback and make adjustments as discussed and recommended.
- 23. eX announced subawards to all PSEP coordinators, Extension Directors, and institutional sponsored program offices on April 22, 2020. The announcement provided information about which states and territories applied for funding, those who did not apply, average indirect cost rates, average application completion time, and a breakdown of the products slated to be produced from these programs for this year of funding.
- 24. eX held online and/or face-to-face meetings to connect partners, subrecipients and others as needed to share content updated and allow for idea sharing and grant compliance assistance.
- 25. The Program Review Committee did not meet to identify potential collaboration between programs this year. Due to COVID-19 and the pivoting that occurred within programs it was decided that this was not the year to push collaboration.
- 26. Sub-recipients submitted 6-month progress reports on July 31, 2019.

Objective 1: Improving the Application, Subaward Disbursement, Monitoring, and Reporting Processes	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
eX held online and face to face meetings among partners, subrecipients and others to share content	X	X	X	
Base amount of funding has been established based on three (3) year average, 2013 - 2015, of the number of applicators certified in the applicants jurisdiction	X	X	X	
eX generated and announced online application and process	X	X	X	
eX developed and implemented online reporting system	X	X	X	
eX offers online trainings	X	X	X	
eX and partners announce subawards	X	X	X	
Subrecipients sign subaward agreements	X	X	X	
Subrecipients receive subawards	X	X	X	
eX creates and announces online support network	X	X	X	
eX offers online trainings on reporting system	X	X	X	
eX generates quarterly EPA report	X	X	X	
eX provides strategic partners with mid-term report	X	X	X	
eX surveys subrecipients to determine the percentage (%) that understand subaward agreement	X	X	X	
Subrecipients submit six (6) month reports	X	X	X	
eX meets with strategic partners to review progress and make adjustments	X	X	X	
eX provides strategic partners with annual report	X	X	X	
Subrecipient eligibility will be limited to land-grant university extension programs in all 50 states, the U.S. territories and the District of Columbia	X	X	X	

Subrecipients will create applications for funding using a simplified online process.	X	X	X	
Subrecipients must agree to comply with all reporting requirements. These are explained online and help is offered for those with questions.	X	X	X	
<u>Objective 2:</u> Professional PSEP education and training delivered nationally				
Strategic partners review educational materials, conduct online workshops and deliver updates	X	X	X	
Strategic partners review subrecipients annual reports, applicator evaluations, EPA and industry/research updates to guide annual workshops	X	X	X	
Strategic partners will provide eX a professional development progress report detailing education successes, needs and a continuous improvement plan	X	X	X	
Each subrecipient generated a minimum of one education deliverable and shared it with the PSEP network	X	X	X	
<u>Objective 3:</u> Improving the PSEFMP by creating and implementing a system for continuous program and administrative improvement				
eX creates advisory committee	X	X	X	
Advisory committee reviews strategic partners input and actions to make recommendations	X	X	X	
Advisory committee contributes input for EPA final report	X	X	X	
Feedback and review of biannual reporting will be reviewed and appropriate actions/solutions identified by strategic partners and the advisory committee will be executed.	X	X	X	
Annually, eX will organize and conduct trainings for subrecipients that include feedback information addressing administrative efficiency, and education affectedness.	X	X	X	
Biannually, eX's advisory committee will make recommendations to improve efficiency and acknowledge	X	X	X	

operations that are working successfully.				
---	--	--	--	--

1.2 Modifications to the Work-plan and Schedule

1.2.1 Include a description of any modifications to the work-plan that were approved during the reporting period. Also mention in this section modifications to the work-plan that will be proposed in the next reporting period. **If none, please state so.**

There were no modifications to the work-plan and there are none proposed for the next reporting period.

Please note that mentioning a proposed modification or item requiring approval in the quarterly progress report does not satisfy the requirement for submitting a request to EPA. Modifications requiring formal approval include changes to the budget and the approved scope of work. Other items requiring approval, such as selection of grant sites, are identified under the terms and conditions of the cooperative agreement.

1.2.2 Please also explain in this section any delays or other problems (if any) encountered during this reporting period for each activity, and describe the corrective measures that are planned. Also mention what kind of assistance (such as training or technical support) is needed to address these problems in the future.

If none, please state so.

.

1.2.3 Submit a revised schedule if changes have occurred. **If none, please state so.**

A revised schedule is not needed at this time.

2. PROJECT FUNDS EXPENDED

Table 1: Costs incurred by task and object class for the year.

Note: Not all drawdowns have occurred yet. Costs are not final. One task assumed. Prior-year unawarded carry-forward, shown on a separate line below, used to augment the approved this year's subaward budget.

	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Total
Personnel	\$88,618.48				
Fringe Benefits	\$20,821.47				
Travel	\$0.00				
Supplies	\$0.00				
Other:					
Subawards	\$905,288.92				
Prior Yr C/F					
Prior Yr Refunds	-\$36,062.16				
Contractual:					
Clerical	\$3,650.00				
Accounting	\$5,726.45				
Legal	\$0.00				
Total Direct	\$988,043.16				

Table 2: Summary of costs incurred for project year.

Object Class	Current Approved Budget (Yr 3)	Costs Incurred This Quarter	Cumulative Costs Incurred to Date	Total Remaining
Personnel	\$90,305.00	\$22,163.82	\$88,618.48	\$1,686.52

Fringe Benefits	\$28,800.00	\$4,751.30	\$20,821.47	\$7,978.53
Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other:				
Subawards	\$846,235.00	\$0.00	\$905,288.92	-\$59,053.32
Prior Yr C/F	\$150,548.76			\$150,548.76
Prior Yr Refunds	0.00	-\$1,121.38	-\$36,062.16	\$36,062.16
Contractual:				
Clerical	\$7,850.00	\$435.00	\$3,650.00	\$4,200.00
Accounting	\$5,850.00	\$1,431.48	\$5,726.45	\$123.55
Legal	\$9,050.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,050.00
Total Direct	\$1,129,588.76	\$27,660.22	\$988,043.16	\$150,595.60

3. BUDGET AND OVERALL PROJECT STATUS

Include an estimate of the time and funds needed to complete the activities identified in the approved work-plan, comparing that estimate with the time and funds remaining, and provide an explanation for any changes. If overall, the project is expected to be on target, please state so. For example, individual tasks may be behind schedule, but overall, is the project expected to be completed on time and within budget?

3.1 Subaward Status

3.2 Project Year Budget Outlook

3.3 Overall Project Budget Outlook

With the incorporation of unawarded funds into each following year, and the steady accumulation of prime-awardee costs over the life of the award, we remain hopeful that we will spend almost all funds within the anticipated five-year life of the award. At the same time, we

already know that we will need a no-cost extension because the subaward cycle runs later than our prime-award calendar. However, based on the work patterns we are seeing three years into this project, we expect that both this extension and the close-out cycle will be very manageable.